### IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

(10)

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

IAN MORDLE,
Petitioner

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

No. 1: cv-00-1163

(Judge Kane) (Magistrate Judge Durkin)

v.

IMMIGRATION & NATURALIZATION SERVICE Respondent

FILED

SEP 2 5 2000

PER DEPUTY CLERK

REPLY TO RESPONDENT'S ANSWER TO ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE.

#### BACKGROUND

Ian Mordle is a citizen of Guyana who entered the United States as a lawful permanent resident on December 14, 1980. On May 12, 1994 Mr. Mordle was convicted of Attempted criminal possession of a Controlled Substance, 7th degree and was sentenced to one year probation. On March 31, 1995 Mr. Mordle was convicted of possession of a weapon and was sentenced to five (5) years probation. On Junary 13, 1997, Mr. Mordle was convicted in Adams Counrt, Pennsylvania, of burglery and was sentenced to imprisonment for (18) to (36) months.

On October 10, 1997, the INS charged Mr. Mordle with being removed for having deen convicted of a controlled substance violance under 8 U.S.C. 1227 (a)(2)(B)(i),8 U.S.C. 1227 (a)(2)(c) and 8 U.S.C. 1227 (a)(2)(A)(iii). On April 21, 1998, Mr. Mordle conceded his deportability and was ordered removed to his home country of Guyana, there was no appeal and the removal order became final.

On June 29, 1999, Mr. Mordle was placed in the custody of the INS, where he remains detained at the York County Prison. Mr. Mordle subsequently filed a petition under 28 U.S.C. 2241, for a writ of habeas corpus challenging the violation of the fifth amendment's prohibition against the deprivation of liberty without due process of law. Mr. Mordle asks this Court to adhere to such precedent and find that his prolonged detention deprives him of his most fundamental right. Mr. Mordle's country of Guyana selectively repatriates it's citizens when they are removed from the United States, and may not issue travel documents to some of it's citizens base d on their crimes, period of time absent from Guyana

these factors place him at a risk for a prolonged bordering on indefinate detention. The INS has sought travel documents from Guyana since July 12, 1999, to present, to no avail. See, (Exhibit 4).

## A. THE STATUTORY AND REGULATORY PREVISIONS GOVERNING DETENTION PENDING DEPORTATION.

Under 8 U.S.C. 1226 (c) and 1231 (a)(1), the Attorney General must detain criminal aliens during removal proceedings and during the initial (90) days after the entry of a final order of removal. After the (90) days removal period the District Director, in the exercise of discretion, may relase from custody, an alien who demonstrates by a clear and convincing evidence that he/she is not a threat to the community and is likely to comply with the removal order when it can be executed. 8 C.F.R. 241.4 (1998).

IN NGO v. IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE, 192 (3rd. Cir. 1999) F. 3d 390 a policy guidelines was establis hed that gave long term detainees automatic review of their custody after the experation of the removal period. The policy guidelines provide detainees an oppertunity to seek release from custody. As of filing of the writ of Habeas Corpus, Mr. Mordle had not received any reviews as claimed by the INS. Mr. Mordle has been in INS custody since June 29, 1999, and was entitled to as prescribed by regulation, a three month review and two six month review during this time period. Mr. Mordle 's constitution and due process rights has been violated, under 8 C.F.R. 241.4 and the third circuit's holding in NGO, as stipulated by the INS.

from custody must demonstrate by clear and convincing evidence that he/she is not a threat to the community and is likely to comply with the removal order when it can be executed.

It is pertinent to note that the Third Circuit in NGO, amended it's oponion to specify that it's holding was confined to excludeable aliens, ofering "no views" on whether the holding would apply to deportable aliens, 192 F.3d at 398 n.7. The Third Circuit found that aliens with criminal backgrounds could be detained for lengthy period provided that appropriate provision for perole were available, and further held that the interim procedures created by the INS, with its Bi-Annual reviews, including the oppertunity for an annual personal interview, satisfied due process. Mr. Mordle's rights to due process has been clearly violated, and his continued dentention pending deportation to Guyana violates his constitutional rights. See. (Exhibit B ( Post Order Custody Review Worksheet ) at p.1.)

The INS claims that Mr. Mordle was issued a filed review on March 13, 2000, See. (Exhibit C). Mr. Mordle never recieved a copy of the custody review, as can be seen, the custody review is addressed to Mr. Mordle at the Berk's County Prison, while Mr. Mordle was detained at the York County Prison. Mr. Mordle was not given the oppertunity to present favorable information to the reviewing officer. Mr. Mordle has numerous family members who are citizens or permanent residents living in the United States along with strong

community ties and a place to live which is not reported on his custody detention worksheet. Mr. Mordle's custody review worksheet is compiled of erroneous informat ion which impacts wether he can be eligeble for release pending travel arrangement s. It is well established that all persons who have entered and established reside note in the United States, reguardless of citizenship or national origin, enjoy the protections of the fifth amendment's prohibition against the deprivation of liber ty without due process of law.

## DEPORTABLE ALIENS ENJOY THE PROTECTIONS OF THE DUE PROCESS CLAUSE OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

The government contends that the petitioner has been "assimilated" to the status of excludeable aliens citing Shaughnessy v. United States ex rel. Mezei 345 U.S. 206, 215 (1953). At such, according to the government, the petitioner no long er comes within the protection of the United States Constitution because his status of a lawfull permenent resident has been terminated. There is no authority to support the government's proposition.

First, the Supreme Court recognized long ago that deportable aliens, even tho se who are unlawfully present in the United States, are protected by the Constitut ion. Yamataya V. Fisher, 189 U.S. 86(1903). This holding has been repeated again and again by the Court without controversy. Plyer V. Doe, 457 U.S. 202(1982); Math ews V. Diaz, 426 U.S. 67(1976). As the court stated in Plyer "we have clearly held that the Firth Amendment protects (even) aliens whose presence in the country is unlawfull..."457 U.S. at 210.

Second the INS points to no authority to support it's ground-breaking legal theory. Instead the INS simply cites a case in which the Supreme Court invokes the concept of "assimilating" an alien's status to prevent the captions deprivation of a lawfull resident alien's Constitutional rights. Mezei 345.U.S. at 206, 215, and the Third Circuit ruling in Ngo, 192 F.3d at 394.

(5)

Unlike the petitioner in <u>Mezei</u>, the petitioner is no t seeking admission to this country. Citing in part, 8 U.S.C. 1101 (a) (13) (defines "entry" into the United States as "a ny coming of an alien into the United States, from a foreign part or place or from an out laying possession...) The petitioner was lawfully admitted into the United States and was a longterm lawfull permanent resident of the United States. There is no evidence supporting the proposition that he should be treated as if "stopped at the border "Mezei, 345 U.S. at 215. Mr. Mordle is an deportable alien, who unlike an excludable alien, has effectuated his entry.

Further, the decision in Mezei and NGO cited by the INS specifically rely upon the distinction between deportabl e and excludable aliens. See, e.g; Mezei, 345 U.S at 216 (ex cludable aliens, unlike resident aliens temporarily detained pending deportation proceedings, may not be released on bond because an exclusion proceeding presents different considera tions); Landon v. Plasencia 459 U.S 21, 24-25(1982) (deportat ion hearings are means to remove aliens who have effected a ctual entry whereas, exclusion refers to proceedings against alien who are seeking inital admission into the United State s); Gisbert v. United States Atty. Gen; 988 F.2d 1437, 1440 (5t h Cir.) as amended 997 F.2d 1122(5th Cir. 1993)(same); Barre ra-echavarria v. Rison 44 F.3d 1441, 1450 (9th Cir.1995) (an alien's constitutional right change "once he gains admission to our country"); Harisiades v. shaughnessy 342 U.S. 580,586 n.9(1951) (aliens, like the petitioner, "in several respects stand on equal footing with citizens"including the scheme is utterly devoid of the fundamental requirements of due proces s, i.e., an oppertunity to be heard "at a meaningful time an d in a meaningful manner. Armstrong v. Manzo, 380 U.S. 545, 5 52 (1965). An impertial arbitrator, and a meaningful oppertu nity to be heard would not unduly burden the INS.

For the reasons and authorities set forth above, cur ent INS custody procedures indefinitely deprive Mr. Mordle of his freedom in violation of procedural due process.

#### CONCLUSION

that the INS would not be able to carry out Mr. Mordle's dep ortation in the foreseeable future, Mr. Mordle's prolonged a nd indefinite detention violates his substantive and procedu ral due process right. Mr. Mordle respectfully request this court issue the writ, and grant his immediate release.

Respectfully submitted,

Lan Mordle

EXHIBIT A.

Case 1:00-cv-01163-YK Document 10 Filed 09/25/2000 Page 9-of 17

# POST ORDER C STODY REVIEW WORKSHE FOR FILE REVIEW AND/OR INTERVIEW

•		·
Detainee Name: MO	RDLE, Ian Paul Da	ate of Birth:11/24/72 "A" Number: 36 476 325
AKAs: Mordle, E		BOP Number:
Country of Birth:	Guyana	Citizenship: Guyana
Date of Arrival:	12/14/80	Place of Arrival: New York, NY
Manner of Arrival:	Immigrant	Last Date into INS Custody: 06/29/99
Entered INS Custoc	ly from:	Local State Federal Institution Other
Location: SCI C	amp Hill	Institution Number: DE-3828
Immigration Histor	y: (Prior INS arrest[s]	/parole/bond/custody information)
Describe:	Custody determination	on of 10/06/97, detained in custody of Service
Deportation Officer	: Timothy J. Sharon	Date of Review: 04/03/00
Location Detained:	York County Prison	
Deportation/Exc	lusion/Removal P	roceedings
List all Charges:	Section 212 Section 241	3 7
Under Final	Order dated April 21,	1998 by II BLA Other
Appeal Waiv	ved/Appeal Time Elaps	sed
Travel Document S	Status/History:	
		of Guyana (NYC) on 07/12/99, Request for 2/06/99, follow up to HQOPS / DDP made on

EXHIBIT B.

INS DISTRICT COUNSEL

215 656 7148 - P.04/88

## POST ORDER 6 STODY REVIEW WORKSHE FOR FILE REVIEW AND/OR INTERVIEW

Detainee Name: MORDLE, Ian Paul Da	ate of Birth:11/24/72 "A" Number: 36 476 325				
AKAs: Mordle, E	BOP Number:				
Country of Birth: Guyana	Citizenship: Guyana				
Date of Arrival: 12/14/80	Place of Arrival: New York, NY				
Manner of Arrival: Immigrant	Last Date into INS Custody: 06/29/99				
Entered INS Custody from:	Local State Federal Institution Other				
Location: SCI Camp Hill	Institution Number: DE-3828				
Immigration History: (Prior INS arrest[s]	/parole/bond/custody information)				
Describe: Custody determination	on of 10/06/97, detained in custody of Service				
Deportation Officer: Timothy J. Sharon Date of Review: 04/03/00					
Location Detained: York County Prison					
Deportation/Exclusion/Removal Proceedings					
List all Charges:   Section 237 (a) (2)(B)(i),(2)(C),(2)(A)(iii)  Section 212 (a) , ,  Section 241 , ,					
Under Final Order dated April 21,					
Appeal Waived/Appeal Time Elaps	sed				
Travel Document Status/History:					
	of Guyana (NYC) on 07/12/99, Request for /06/99, follow up to HQOPS / DDP made on				

	: 34 11	4S DISTRICT	COUNSEL		215 656	7148	P.Ø5/凶
	esentative / A						
G-28 Filed:	Yes	No No					
Legal Rep/At	ty. Notified of	Interview:	☐ Yes	⊠ N/A	by: on:		
Name of Rep	resentative / At	torney:	N/A				
Mailing Addr	'ess:	Tele	phone Numb	er:			
Present durin	g interview:		☐ Yes	☑ No			
Criminal H	istory						
	Inited States: ferime, whether c		nce imposed, da	e, and country	· · ·		
probation 03/	States: Crimi 31/95. Crimina . Burglary, Cri	ıl possession	of a controlle	d substance,	convicted Kin	gs CO, ]	
NCIC Check	s:	Crimina	al History	□ No i	ecord Found		
		(State	e and Federal)		•		
<b>FBI</b> # 35776 Summ	5TA2 ary of NCIC Cl		Above		SID# NY 6709	9033P	
			Above		SID# NY 6709	9033P	
Summ		necks: See			SID# NY 6709	9033P	·
Summ	ary of NCIC Ci	ary Recor	d	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	SID# NY 6709	√ No	

Disciplinary reports and Incidents while in INS Custody? Yes No

If Yes, List & Describe: On 08/12/99, detained was found to be making alcohol in his cell. On 08/16/99, detained admitted guilt at review hearing and given 30 days in BAU.

On 08/12/99, detainee and another were destroying county property. On 08/16/99, detainee was found guilty of not reporting incident.

AUG-14-2000 16:34

INS DISTRICT COUNSEL

215 656 7148 P.06/08

Specifics of Inter	view					
Date of File Review	: · · 0	4/03/00				
Date of Detaince In	terview: N	N/A				·
Location of Interview	:w: 1	V/A				
Interviewing Office	r:#1: 1	√A				
	#2: (	optional)				
Interpreter Used: Language/Dialect:	☐ Yes	☐ No	Name:			
Does the detainee h	ave a plac	e to live in the l	United States?	Ye	es 🗹	No
Address:	Unknow	n, alien did not p	provide any info	ormation		
Is the detainee subj	ect to any	parole or prob	ation requiren	nents?	Yes	☐ No
Describe:	On páro	le in PA			/	ż
Does the detainee h	ave close	family ties with	in the United S	States?	Yes	□ No
Describe:	Both pa	rents reside in N	Y State			
Does the detainee h	ave any c	ommunity ties o	or non-governa No	nental spoi	isors?	
Describe:	N/A		j 140			
Does the detainee h	ave any e	mployment pro	spects?	] Yes	⊠ No	
Describe:	N/A					
What is the detaine	e's emplo	yment history?				
Describe:	Unknow	n, none provide	d :			•
What is the detained	e's educa	tional level?				
Describe: U	nknown no	information pro	ovided			·
Does the detainee h	ave anv v	ocational traini	no?			

Page 3

Describe: Unknown, no information provided

AUG-14-2000 16:33 [N

215 656 7148 2,02/08

The INS detainee was found	CREDIBLE	☐ NOT CREDIBLE
		<b>_</b>

Explain: N/A

#### Officer Comments/Analysis & Recommendation

Mordle has been convicted on three separate occasions for weapons, drugs and burglary. While detained at YCP he was found making alcohol in his cell and acted as a look out for a fellow detainee who was breaking out the window in his cell. A written notice of this review was sent to Mordle via the prison mail on 03/13/00, as of this report date, 04/03/00 the detainee has not provided any information to review on his behalf.

Based on the seriousness of Mordle's convictions and his disciplinary record while detained at York County Prison, I recommend that Mordle remain in detention pending the issuance of travel documents or until his next post order interview.

Interviewing Officer #1:

Timothy J. Shearon

Detain Release

Interviewing Officer #2:

(optional)

Reviewed by:

Detain Release

Date:

Concur Do Not Concur

### DISTRICT DIRECTOR'S CUSTODY DETERMINATION

RELEASE FROM CUS	TODY / ORDER OF SUPERVIS	ION	
☐ RELEASE FROM CUS	STODY / ORDER OF SUPERVIS	ION UNDER BO	ND
Bond Amount:		÷	
CONTINUE IN CUSTO	DDY / SCHEDULE FOR REVIE	w in six monti	is .
Comments (attach additional sh	neet(s) if necessary):		
INS District Office:	PHI		
Signature of District Director: or of Designee (ADD, DADD)	THEODORE R. ADRICHARK ASSISTANT SISTANT SHACTER DETENTION AND DEPORTATION (Printed Name & Title)		Date: 4-17
HEADQUARTER'S R	EVIEW OF CONTINUE	ED DETENTI	ON
Reviewing Officers	Concur	Reconsider	Date
(Name, Title, Signature)	<del></del>		
(Name, Title, Signature)			

For comments, please refer to the "Headquarters Post Order Custody Review" form.

EXHIBIT C.

INS DISTRICT COUNSEL

215 656 7148 P 08/08



U.S. Department of Justice Immigration and Naturalization Service

1600 Callowhill Street Philadelphia, PA 19130

A#36 476 325

Ian Paul MORDLE C/O Berks County Prison RD#1 Box 265 Leesport, PA 19533

### Notice to Alien of File Custody Review

You are detained in the custody of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) and you are required to cooperate with the INS in effecting your removal from the United States. If the INS has not removed you from the United States within the removal period as set forth in INA 241(a) (normally 90-days) of either: 1) your entering INS custody with a final order of removal, deportation or exclusion, or 2) the date of any final order you receive while you are in INS custody, the INS District Director will review your case for consideration of release on an Order of Supervision. Release, however, is dependent on your demonstrating by "clear and convincing evidence" that you will not pose a danger to the community and will not be a significant flight risk.

Your custody status will be reviewed on or about: (April 3, 2000). The District Director may consider, but is not limited to considering the following:

- The nature and seriousness of your criminal convictions;
- 2. Other criminal history;
- Sentence(s) imposed and time actually served;
- 4. History of escapes, failures to appear for judicial or other proceedings, and other defaults;
- 5. Probation history;

Signistule of Officer

- Disciplinary problems while incarcerated;
- Evidence of rehabilitative effort or recidivism;
- 8. Equities in the United States;
- 9. Prior immigration violations and history; and
- 10. Cooperation in obtaining your travel document.

You may submit any documentation you wish to be reviewed in support of your release, prior to the date listed above, to the attention of the Officer and address below. English translations must be provided pursuant to 8 CFR 103.2(b)(3). An attorney or other person may submit materials on your behalf.

> U.S. Department of Justice Immigration and Naturalization Service Attn.: Timothy J. Shearon, Deportation Officer 3400 Concord Road York, PA 17402

#### METHOD OF SERVICE

I certify that this form was provided to the alien by:

(Hand)

() CC: Attorney of Record or Designated Representative

Date

MAR 13 2000

(Institution Mail)